, ³ .	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	09/688,079	HERMAN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Padmashri Ponnaluri	1639
All Participants:	Status of Application:	
(1) <u>Padmashri Ponnaluri</u> .	(3)	
(2) <u>Applicants attorney Kolomavets</u> , Daniel Ryan	(4)	
Date of Interview: 29 September 2004	Time:	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ Yes, provide a brief description:	cant's representative)	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed:		
Claims discussed: claim 38		
Prior art documents discussed:		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENE See Continuation Sheet	ERAL NATURE OF WHAT V	VAS DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summation 	he examiner will provide a ware record of the substance of	ritten summary of the substance the interview, since the interview
•		
		0
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Application	nt/Applicant's Representative	e Signature – ir appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner has called applicants attorney Daniel Ryan and was informed that the application was transferred to Law Firm 'Cook Alex Mcfarron Cummings & Mehler.' Attorney Kolomayets (reg # 33723) discussed claim 38, and suggested claim language to clear the confusion regardign the over wrap. Mr. Kolomayets has informed that a Revocation of Power of Attorney is in the process and would be filed soon.